ORIGINAL

Federal Covamination of Commission

Office of the Goodbary

FEDERAL CON Wa	BEFORE THE MMUNICATIONS COMMIS ashington, D.C. 20554	SION SEIVED - FCC
DOCKE	T FILE COPY ORIGINAL	SEP 2 8 2004
In Re: Matter of)	Federal Communication Commission Bureau/Office
Amendment of Section 73.202(b),	POORET FILE COPY ORIGINA	ket No. 04-258
lable of Allotments,) RM-1100	O RECEIVED
FM Broadcast Stations.)	navervay
(Levan and Richfield, UT))	OCT - 7 2004

REPLY COMMENTS OF MICRO COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Micro Communications, Inc. ("Micro"), pursuant to Sections 1.415 and 1.420 of the Commission's rules, hereby respectfully submits its reply comments in the referenced matter.¹

1. In response to the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order to Show Cause, DA 04-2129, released July 20, 2004 ("NPRM"), Mid-Utah Radio, Inc. ("Mid-Utah") filed comments and a counterproposal. The NPRM had found that Micro's proposal would serve the public interest and had afforded Mid-Utah an opportunity to demonstrate why its authorization for station KCYQ(FM) should not be modified to specify operation on Channel 244C in lieu of Channel 229C at Richfield in order to accommodate Micro's proposal. Mid-Utah counterproposed the allotment of Channel 231C to Boulder Town, Colorado for its first local transmission service and, to accommodate that allotment, to substitute Channel 229C at Mount Pleasant, Utah in lieu of Channel 229C at Richfield for KCYQ. On that basis, Mid-Utah contended that its counterproposal was mutually exclusive with Micro's initial proposal herein.²

No. of Cepies reold 014 List ABODE

To:

The Chief, Allocations Branch

¹ Zeta Holdings, LLC, under common control with Micro, became licensee of the subject Levan station following consummation of a *pro forma* license assignment application (BALH-20040415AEM). For the sake of consistency, we will continue to refer to the petitioner as Micro herein.

² The Commission has not yet determined whether to accept Mid-Utah's counterproposal. We assume that, upon such acceptance, the Commission will set new dates for reply comments. In the meantime, however, Micro wishes to submit the instant reply comments which, if need be, can be supplemented or superseded, as appropriate, by reply

- 2. As an initial matter, it should be noted that Mid-Utah's filing is not a genuine counterproposal. The only mutual exclusivity with Micro's proposal is the relocation of KCYQ to Mount Pleasant, ostensibly in order to permit the allotment of Channel 231C to Boulder Town. However, as noted in the attached engineering statement of D S Broadcasting Company, that is a contrived result, as there is no need at all to involve KCYQ in order to achieve a first Class C service at Boulder Town. Channel 284C will provide Boulder Town with its first service, and will provide the same gain area as Channel 231C, but without any need to involve KCYQ (or KCFM, for that matter). Accordingly, if Mid-Utah really wants to provide tiny Boulder Town with a Class C facility, it can readily do so outside this rulemaking.
- 3. Even so, Mid-Utah seeks to change the community of license of KCYQ from Richfield to Mount Pleasant. However, as the attached engineering statement demonstrates, that change does not require mutual exclusivity with Micro's proposal either. Specifically, Channel 244C may be used at Mount Pleasant with comparable public interest benefits to the use of Channel 229C. Consequently, there is no need for the Commission to choose between mutually exclusive proposals, as Mid-Utah's counterproposal can be implemented using Channel 244C which, unlike Mid-Utah's counterproposal for Channel 229C, would cause no mutual exclusivity with Micro's proposal to use Channel 229C at Levan. Accordingly, both the original proposal and the counterproposal may be achieved, thereby enabling the public interest benefits of both to be achieved.

comments filed in response to any forthcoming Public Notice accepting Mid-Utah's counterproposal.

³ A site restriction of approximately 15 km south is assumed. Mid-Utah's Exhibit E, Figure 4 suggests that this site restriction in fact will locate the station closer to Mount Pleasant than its hypothetical allotment site. It would further appear from Figures 5 and 6 of the same Exhibit E that the restriction would have a minimal impact upon the gain and loss areas upon which Mid-Utah relies for its public interest showing. In any event, these gains and losses pale beside the underserved gain areas (and no loss areas) incident to the Boulder Town allotment which, as noted in paragraph 2, supra, can be realized independent of either the subject Micro or Mid-Utah stations.

4. In view of the foregoing, Micro respectfully submits that by using Channel 284C at Boulder and Channel 244C at Mount Pleasant, both Micro's original proposal and Mid-Utah's counterproposal can be implemented.

Respectfully submitted,

MICRO COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

By:____

Peter Gutmann Its Attorney

Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC

1401 I Street, NW Seventh Floor Washington, DC 20005 (202) 857-4532

September 28, 2004

David C. Schaberg.

Radio Consultant 3105 S. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. #169 Lansing, Michigan 48910-2939

Office 517-393-1037 - - Fax 517-272-1037

September 28, 2004

Channel 244C will work at Mount Pleasant, UT, as a full class C station (comparable to present license), at the following coordinates, located approximately 15km south of Mount Pleasant, UT.

39 24 49 N 111 23 56 W

As far as the proposal to place a channel at Boulder Town, UT, other options exist including channel 284C which will allocate to the city center coordinates of Boulder Town, and has a wide range of actual tower location options.

Very truly yours.

David C. Schaberg

Consultant to Micro Communications

Channel 244C for Mount Pleasant, UT at Haystack Mountain, 1km West of Skyline Drive

REFERENCE 39 24 49 N 111 23 56 W

Call	Chann	iel i	Location		pist	Azi	FCC	Margin
RDEL KCFM RADD AL244 RDEL RADD KKEX KXRK KZHT.C KZHT KQSW KENZ RDEL AL246	ADD 24 RSV 24 ADD 24 ADD 24 LIC 24	14C Level 14C1 Project 14C1 Pro	van van chfield van eston ithfield eston ovo lt Lake City it Lake City ck Springs em aver	U D G G F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F	9.67 9.67 33.55 36.69 275.14 275.14 154.35 154.35 154.38 296.17 106.56 165.94	208.0 208.0 252.3 296.3 352.9 352.9 352.9 334.0 334.0 334.0 334.8 220.8	290.0 290.0 270.0 270.0 270.0 270.0 105.0 105.0 141.0 48.0 95.0	-280.33 -280.33 -256.45 -233.31 5.14 5.14 49.35 49.35 49.36 55.17 58.56 70.94

Certificate of Service

I, Peter Gutmann, an attorney in the law firm of Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC, do hereby certify that I have on this 28th day of September, 2004, caused copies of the foregoing Reply Comments of Micro Communications, Inc. to be mailed to the following by first-class United States mail, postage prepaid:

Shelley Sadowski, Esquire Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW East Lobby, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20007-5201 (counsel to Mid-Utah Radio, Inc.)

Peter Gutmann